

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Concerning the Causes of the Differences of Opinion
Between the Faculty and the Board of Trustees in a
Number of Matters including the Selection of a New
President for the University

Within a week of the meeting of June 7, 1965, President Colclough appointed Professor James Forrester Davison, in place of Professor Roderic H. Davison who was out of the country, to complete the group of three members of this special committee. The Committee got under way at once and decided to interview as many people as possible who had been connected with the selection of a new president first.

The Committee interviewed six members of the Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees in the Selection of a President, and the Chairman wrote to the other four members and asked them if they had any information they cared to give to us. In several instances, it was indicated that the former members of the Faculty Committee did not care to communicate any information to us. The Committee also interviewed Acting President O. S. Colclough, the new Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. E. K. Morris, and the new Vice Chairman, Mr. Charles K. Phillips, two alumni members of the Board of Trustees, Deans Linton, Burns, and John A. Brown and the President-designate Lloyd H. Elliott. We were received with a great showing of cooperation. This involved interviews with fifteen persons and the interviews ranged from one to three hours. In two instances, two persons were interviewed on the same occasion and were able to supplement one another's reactions. The Committee did not interview the former Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Newell Ellison, nor the former Vice Chairman, Mr. Benjamin McKelway.

While the commission given to this Committee includes all recent issues on which the Board of Trustees and the Faculty have differed, because of its importance, the Committee concentrated on the work of the Faculty Committee and the Board of Trustees Committee for the selection of a new president for the University. In three instances, the Committee did discuss briefly with persons being interviewed the question of the AAUP minimum salary scale and the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics of the Senate. Both of these Faculty recommendations were rejected by the Board of Trustees. If there is time, it is hoped that more information on these subjects may be obtained from persons connected with the Trustees' decisions. Individual members of the Committee also checked personally certain details of time, dates and texts of relevant written material with other persons who had personal information in detail on these matters. This checking was done to verify information received in our formal interviews.

Our special committee has reached the conclusion that the procedure for advising and consulting between Faculty and Board of Trustees did not prove adequate to achieve the purposes which the Faculty had in mind in these cases. The following paragraphs state in summary form the basis for this conclusion:

- 1) There were infrequent meetings between the Trustees Committee and the Faculty Committee; one in October, one in April, one semi-formal meeting in May, one formal meeting in May and two formal meetings in June. Communication was maintained between the two committees through the Chairman of the Board of Trustees who was also the Chairman of the Board Committee. As stated below, this communication turned out to be quite inadequate for the purposes.

2) There was a lack of agreed-upon criteria to be followed by the two committees in seeking candidates for the presidency of the University. The Faculty Committee had on its part early submitted certain general principles which it regarded as helpful for such a purpose. Yet there never was any explicit response to this from the Trustees Committee, either in terms of acceptance or rejection. While the proposed criteria were rather broad, they nonetheless had the virtue of facilitating communication in this process.

3) There was a lack of any formal agreement or understanding between the two Committees as to how much weight was to be given to expressions of approval or disapproval of particular candidates on the part of the Faculty Committee. While the Faculty Committee had at all times a perfectly clear understanding concerning the full legal authority of the Board in this matter, it assumed that any reasoned disapproval on its part would contribute a major obstacle to the selection of a particular candidate by the Board, at least until that obstacle had been cleared. Without such an assumption, its function could hardly be regarded as meaningful by the Faculty Committee or the Faculty which had established it. The last President of the University, the late Dr. Carroll, had been selected with the full approval of another Faculty Committee, even prior to the adoption of the Faculty Code. This fact could be considered a significant precedent. Finally, one candidate who had been regarded as most acceptable by the Board Chairman had been dropped after the Faculty Committee had set forth to the Chairman its strong reasons for objecting to this particular individual.

4) Our review of the relationships between the two committees made it clear that during the May/June period, the communications from the Chairman of the Board to the Faculty Committee were lacking in candor. In view of the fundamental requirement of good faith throughout this whole process, this lack

introduced a disturbing element of uncertainty and distrust into the last stage of the selection process. We have also learned that Dr. Elliott was offered the presidency of The George Washington University without disclosure of the adverse faculty reaction here. We believe that his acceptance of this position under such circumstances put him in a very embarrassing position both in Maine and in Washington, D. C. for which he should not be criticized. We wish to welcome him now to The George Washington University.

5) The inability of the Faculty Committee to obtain from the Board Committee or its Chairman for the first six months meaningful information was the result of inaction by the Board Committee. It also affected adversely the Faculty Committee's role and made it appear to be somewhat of an outsider in the selection process. While the information on a number of names was available in the winter for several months, the process of selection appeared to have come to a dead end early in the month of May.

6) The lack of indications to the Faculty from its Committee to show continuing positive action in the process of selection had a good deal to do with stimulating individual communications to the Board of Trustees, out of channels, by Faculty members. It would appear that the first memorandum from the Deans and Chairmen to the Board of Trustees dated May 8, 1965 was communicated directly to the Board rather than through the Faculty Committee for much the same reasons. While these actions were undertaken by members of the University moved by a deep concern for the welfare of the University, they had some unintended side effects; a) from the point of view of some of those persons primarily concerned in the selection process, they appear to diminish the authority of the Faculty Committee, and b) in the eyes of some members of the Board of Trustees, they appear to be manifestations of improper group pressures from the Faculty.

7) A word is in order about the role of the Washington press in this process. At critical stages both before the Board of Trustees made its choice, and on several occasions afterward, the local newspapers displayed a disquieting lack of responsibility which was shown in possibly unavoidable inadequacy in effectual reporting and in distorted editorial comment. The issues involved have been misrepresented with the result that interested members of the Washington community have received a highly distorted view of the University's situation.

Since the connection between key members of the University Board of Trustees and the two leading Washington newspapers is widely known, this relationship has unfortunately lent in the eyes of many persons a certain plausibility to the view that these papers allowed themselves to be used as an instrument in the relations between the Trustees and the Faculty of The George Washington University. We deplore this view as over-simplified, but even more, we deplore the press activities which made possible these allegations both for the sake of the University and the community which it serves.

Your Committee is continuing its investigations of a number of matters which appear to be of general concern in Faculty/Trustee relations, and will make a full report on these issues, together with its recommendations, at a later meeting of the Faculty Assembly.

Reuben E. Wood, Chairman

Wolfgang H. Kraus

James Forrester Davison

Professor Lucien Wood
26 August

7) A word is in order about the role of the Washington Press in all this. At critical stages in the selection process, both immediately before the Board of Trustees made its choice and on several occasions since, local newspapers have displayed a disquieting lack of responsibility both in terms of allegedly factual reporting and of highly biased editorial comment.

The issues involved have been misrepresented with the result that interested members of the Washington community have received a highly distorted view of the University situation. Since the connection between key members of the Board of Trustees with the two leading Washington papers is widely known, this has unfortunately lent, in the eyes of many, a certain plausibility to the view that these papers have allowed themselves to be used as tools in a power struggle between the Trustees and the Faculty of The George Washington University.

We deplore this view as rather over-simplified, but (we deplore) even more the press activities which have given rise to such allegations, both for the sake of the University and the community which it serves.

A REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
ON RELATIONS BETWEEN THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
AND THE FACULTY CREATED BY RESOLUTION OF
JUNE 7, 1965

The following report is concurred in by Professor Reuben Wood who is now on sabbatical leave. He has asked me to transmit his resignation from this committee to the Faculty Assembly, and this committee has asked me to present this report today.

At a meeting of the Faculty Assembly on September 15, 1965, Professor Wood for the Committee, made a report on one of the three areas of dissension between the Faculty and the Board of Trustees, namely, the rejection by the Board of Trustees of the recommendation of the Special Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult in the Selection of a President for the University. That report pointed out that one of the basic causes of the Trustees' action having been taken contrary to the recommendation of the duly elected faculty committee and the undesirable and unpleasant consequences of the action having been taken under that circumstance, was the inadequacy of the arrangements and procedures for faculty participation in presidential selection. This committee knows of nothing that has been done by the Board of Trustees to avoid this inadequacy in future cases. At the present time, however, we have no recommendation to make with respect to this matter. There are two remaining topics which we believe to be within our commission and this report will deal with those two topics.

I

The members of the Special Committee of the Faculty Assembly joined the University Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits) all of whose members were present in the conference December 21, 1965 which was held as a preliminary to a meeting of the Senate Committee with members of the Personnel Committee of the Board of Trustees. Because Professor Wilson's Report of this meeting discusses it in detail, and duplicates part of this report, as actually presented by Professor Davison, that part of this report is omitted at this point. A copy of the full report is on file with the Journal of Minutes in the Registrar's office.7

existence of a large deficit nor about its undesirability. The main differences are with respect to (a) the value to the University and its members of these expenditures, (b) the probability of largely decreasing or wiping out this deficit in the near future while continuing an intercollegiate athletic program on essentially its present basis, and (c) possibly some disagreement as to the proper basis of computing the deficit. The Ad Hoc Senate committee of 1965 felt more concerned with the issue as represented by the continuing large deficit. The tangible issues of finance and the educational and facility gaps in many areas of the University, demonstrated to us that even the present football costs were entirely beyond the University's resources. The two groups also disagreed as to the real costs to the University in tuition aid over and above the football operating deficit.

These matters were brought out very clearly in a conference which members of our Special Assembly Committee and of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee had with the Trustees Committee on Athletics. The Trustees Committee report asserts the loss of the University's membership in the Southern Conference which would follow the withdrawal of football from that conference's schedules, as recommended in the 1965 Senate Committee report. The Ad Hoc Committee did not propose the other sports would be outside the Southern Conference. The Trustees Committee concluded that termination of football would have the effect that other sports would also be outside the conference and that serious difficulties could be expected in their scheduling. The Trustees Committee was concerned that the University image in the community would have a negative aspect if the present football program were to be terminated. They wanted the present football program continued until a positive solution of the issues could be formulated. They recognized that the present rate of student and alumni attendance was too low and might be improved by better promotion. The Board's acceptance of this report with the recommendation that "positive results" be achieved as soon as possible, means we believe that it

Mr. Mitchell appeared to be very sympathetic to this approach and his interest appeared to be echoed by Trustee Hays. While Mr. Mitchell stated that he could only speak for himself, he conveyed the impression that he would recommend these concepts to fellow members of his committee and hopefully to the Board of Trustees. The members of the Faculty Assembly special committee believe, therefore, that this conference with the Board members will lead to increasing numbers of such contacts in the future, as it was indicated that both groups would like to have further discussion on these matters. Both President Elliott and Mr. E. K. Morris have indicated extension of these joint conferences is desirable in many fields, and the creation of special councils to some extent already achieved, composed of members of the Board of Trustees and of the University Faculty and also including others with special interests or qualification with respect to the different colleges, schools and divisions will also engender continuing communication. We hope that mutually satisfactory relationships will develop in due course but all the apparatus for consulting between Senate Committees and Trustees committees may become only a deceptive veneer unless it is given substance by action in accord with reasonable recommendations. The urgency of action by the Board of Trustees in establishing a satisfactory faculty salary policy is great and, we firmly believe, delay in this matter will be at great and increasing risk to faculty morale and the quality of the teaching staff and the reputation of the University.

II

The other matter which was of concern to the Faculty Assembly and the University Senate in 1965 was the apparent rejection by the Board of Trustees of the recommendations of the Special Ad Hoc Committee of the University Senate on Athletics. However, the difference between the recommendation of the University Senate and the position of the Board of Trustees does not represent any disagreement about the

aims at a reduction of costs, better promotion, with better teams and improved attendance.

The out-of-pocket deficit up to \$103,000 in 1961 had increased from \$77,000 in 1962 to \$146,000 for the 1963 season to \$157,000 for the 1964 season and appears to have been reduced to about \$88,000 for the recent 1965 season. At the same time, the tuition aid to the football squad had been \$55,000 in 1961, \$65,000 in 1962, \$78,000 in 1963, \$84,000 in 1964 and, though the year is not over, at the rate of about \$104,000 (72 football tuitions authorized) a year. The last increases were caused primarily by raises in tuition, which may occur again. Also the operating deficit for 1965 only reflects the books as of December 31, 1965 and may increase as it did in the 1964 figures.

The exclusion of the tuition aid costs from the full costs of the football program is a matter of some misunderstanding and substantial disagreement within the University. Our Committee believes that tuition costs should be included in the over-all costs but it has been stated by some persons in the University that tuition does not represent a real cost to the University and should not be included in calculations of costs in the program.

Before the flood of applications by students for admission to the University which we presently face, it might have been argued that the tuition aid for the football program represented students who would not otherwise have sought admission to the University. No other students at that time were rejected because there were no places for them in the University residences or classes. But even then, the budgets of the various academic units required that they provide extra funds to take care of the necessary teachers, room spaces, library places and equipment to accommodate these football program students. There was therefore a very significant amount of extra cost to the University's operating expenses in these football tuition aids. No business could operate successfully for very long with such hidden overheads. In our discussions with business men on the Board Committee, they appear to have agreed with this analysis.

At the present time, with the great demand for places in our entering classes of the University, the rate in the Fall term 1965 would be at the rate of \$104,000 a year. Though subsequent casualties of the football squad in the academic field will make it less for the full year, nevertheless there has been a very substantial loss of tuition payments from other tuition-paying students, who could take the places represented by the football squad tuition payments by the University.

Adding these tuition costs, we find the figures for the year 1961, \$153,000; for the year 1962 would be \$143,000; for the year 1963, \$225,000; for the year 1964, \$240,000 and for the year 1965, \$192,000. This is progress, but in view of our unsatisfied needs in the University both in recreational facilities and educational and salary requirements, to spend in the last three years an average of over \$200,000 a year on football is hard to justify. Taking the years 1961 through 1965, the figures show, including tuition aid, that we have spent over \$900,000 on the football program which has not yet produced the success we were promised. While we cannot tell what the future has for this University, we do not believe we can accept the assurance that continuation of this program will effect or promote a standard of academic excellence.

III

Our discussion has been limited by the terms of reference in the resolution of the Faculty Assembly of June 7, 1965, which dealt with the disagreements between the Faculty Committees and the Board of Trustees before that date. The University Senate Committee on Athletics this year has been acting as a group of observers in the matters discussed above and has made, and plans to make, no recommendations concerning the football program of the University this year.

We would recommend therefore that steps be taken to put the Senate Committee on Athletics in touch with the Trustees Committee on Athletics in the same manner

in which the Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits) has started an exchange of ideas in a continuing dialogue with the Personnel Committee of the Board of Trustees. Our Faculty Assembly Committee has found its members in the position of making studies which are of concern to the standing committees of the University Senate on Athletics and on Appointments, Salary and Promotion Policies. We do not believe that we should continue to perform our function to the extent that it will duplicate work which is the primary responsibility of the standing committees of the University Senate. We believe that these committees should be allowed to continue their routine investigations in their areas, with the advantage of contacts with the Board committees that we hope can be established. We therefore respectfully request the Faculty Assembly to discharge our committee from continuing investigation in these areas. We suggest that if the Senate Committees encounter any problems by way of communication or exchange of ideas that they be authorized to refer the questions to the Executive Committee of the Senate to obtain its good offices to establish the necessary communication for continued dialogue with the committees of the Board of Trustees. In especially difficult areas, the Executive Committee should be authorized to make an informal request to our committee, if it is continued in existence, that it make a further study of the difficult area.

If the Faculty Assembly believes that this special three-member committee which it established at its meeting June 7, 1965 should be continued in existence, it is requested, because of Professor Wood's current sabbatical-leave status, to name a successor for him. Also, as the ad hoc member of this ad hoc committee, I would appreciate relief from further duties on this committee and substitution of another member in my place.

sgd: J. Forrester Davison, for
the Special Faculty Assembly Committee

J. Forrester Davison
Wolfgang H. Kraus
Reuben E. Wood, Chairman

The Faculty Assembly
February 8, 1966

Professor Kraus

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY
OF THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Interim Report on the Matter of the
Selection of the New President of
the University

At its special meeting on June 7, 1965, the Faculty Assembly passed this resolution:

"That the Faculty Assembly appoint a committee consisting of Professor Reuben E. Wood, Chairman, and Professor Wolfgang H. Kraus and Roderic H. Davison, former chairmen of the Executive Committee of the University Senate, to ascertain the facts in all cases in which the Board of Trustees have not seen fit or do not see fit to follow the recommendations of the Faculty Assembly or the University Senate and, with all reasonable speed to report its findings and recommendations to the Faculty Assembly."

Within a week of the meeting of June 7, 1965, President Golclough appointed Professor James Forrester Davison as pro tempore member of the Committee to serve in place of Professor Roderic H. Davison who was out of the country. The present interim report is the first report of this standing committee.

The commission given to this Committee includes all recent issues on which the Board of Trustees and the Faculty have differed. Specifically, these issues are: (1) The matter of the Senate resolution on faculty salaries, (2) the matter of the Senate-adopted report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics and (3) the matter of the selection of the new president of the University.

Some facts have been collected concerning the first two items, but the Committee felt that its most urgent assignment was the investigation of the presidential selection process, and it concentrated its efforts on this investigation. The other two items will be the subject of future study and reports. The remainder of this report concerns the selection of the new president. Here we shall present findings of fact and shall, with one exception, defer our recommendations to a subsequent report.

The Committee interviewed six members of the Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees in the Selection of a President, and the Chairman

wrote to the other four members and asked them if they had any information they cared to give to us. In several instances, it was indicated that the former members of the Faculty Committee did not care to communicate any information to us. The Committee also interviewed Acting President O. S. Colclough, the new Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. E. K. Morris, and the new Vice Chairman, Mr. Charles K. Phillips, two alumni members of the Board of Trustees, Dean of Faculties John A. Brown, Deans Linton and Burns, and the President-designate Lloyd H. Elliott. There were interviews with fifteen persons and the interviews ranged from one to three hours. We were received with a great showing of cooperation. In two instances, two persons were interviewed on the same occasion and were able to supplement one another's reactions.

The Committee did not interview the former Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Newell Ellison, nor the former Vice Chairman, Mr. Benjamin McKelway.

Individual members of the Committee also checked certain details of time and dates and texts of relevant written material with other persons who had detailed information on these matters. This checking was done to amplify and verify information received in our formal interviews.

This Committee has reached the conclusion that the procedure for advising and consulting between Faculty and Board of Trustees did not provide an adequate opportunity for exploring issues with the Board, for supporting the Faculty position, and for achieving a meeting of minds.

The following paragraphs state in summary form the basis for this conclusion:

- 1) There were infrequent meetings between the Trustees Committee and the Faculty Committee; one in October, one in April, one semi-formal meeting in May, one formal meeting in May and two formal meetings in June. Communication was maintained between the two committees through the Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

who was also the Chairman of the Board Committee. This communication, we feel, was inadequate.

2) There was a lack of agreed-upon criteria to be followed by the two committees in seeking candidates for the presidency of the University. The Faculty Committee had on its part early submitted certain general principles which it regarded as helpful for such a purpose. Yet there never was any explicit response to this from the Trustees Committee, either in terms of acceptance or rejection. While the proposed criteria were rather broad, they nonetheless should have had the virtue of facilitating communication in this process.

3) There was a lack of any formal agreement or understanding between the two Committees as to how much weight was to be given to expressions of approval or disapproval of particular candidates on the part of the Faculty Committee. While the Faculty Committee had at all times a perfectly clear understanding concerning the full legal authority of the Board in this matter, it assumed that any reasoned disapproval on its part would contribute a major obstacle to the selection of a particular candidate by the Board, at least until that obstacle had been cleared. Without such an assumption, its function could hardly be regarded as meaningful by the Faculty Committee or the Faculty which had established it. The last President of the University, the late Dr. Carroll, had been selected with the full approval of another Faculty Committee, even prior to the adoption of the Faculty Code. This fact could be considered a significant precedent. Moreover, one candidate in the present search who had been regarded as most acceptable by the Board Chairman had been dropped after the Faculty Committee had set forth to the Chairman its strong reasons for objecting to this particular individual.

4) Our review of the relationships between the two committees made it clear that during the May/June period, the communications from the Chairman of the Board to the Faculty Committee were lacking in candor. In view of the fundamental

requirement of good faith throughout this whole process, this lack introduced a disturbing element of uncertainty and distrust into the last stage of the selection process. We have also learned that Dr. Elliott was offered and accepted the presidency of The George Washington University without disclosure of the adverse recommendation of the Faculty Advisory Committee. We believe that his acceptance of this position under such circumstances put him in a very embarrassing position both in Maine and in Washington, D. C. for which he was not primarily responsible. We recommend that the Faculty welcome Dr. Lloyd Elliott as the new President of The George Washington University.

5) The inability of the Faculty Committee to obtain from the Board Committee or its Chairman for the first four months meaningful information as to the candidates under active consideration, was the result of inaction by the Board Committee. It also affected adversely the Faculty Committee's role and made it appear to be somewhat of an outsider in the selection process. While the information on a number of names was available in the winter for several months, progress in the process of selection appeared to have come to a dead end early in the month of May.

6) The lack of indications to the Faculty from its Committee, to show continuing positive action in the process of selection, stimulated individual communications to the Board of Trustees, out of channels, by Faculty members. It would appear that the first memorandum from the Deans and Chairmen to the Board of Trustees dated May 8, 1965 was communicated directly to the Board rather than through the Faculty Committee for much the same reasons. While these actions were undertaken by members of the University moved by a deep concern for the Welfare of the University, they had some unintended side effects; a) from the point of view of some of those persons primarily concerned in the selection process, they appeared to diminish the authority of the Faculty Committee, and b) in the eyes of some members of the Board of Trustees, they appeared to be manifestations of improper group pressures from the Faculty.

7) A word is in order about the role of the Washington press in this process. At critical stages both before the Board of Trustees made its choice, and on several occasions afterward, the local newspapers displayed a disquieting lack of responsibility which was shown in possibly unavoidable inadequacy in factual reporting and in distorted editorial comment. The issues involved have been misrepresented with the result that interested members of the Washington community have received a highly distorted view of the University's situation.

Inasmuch as the connection between key members of the University Board of Trustees and the two leading Washington newspapers is widely known, this relationship has unfortunately lent in the eyes of some persons a certain plausibility to the view that these papers allowed themselves to be used as an instrument in the relations between the Trustees and the Faculty of The George Washington University. We deplore this view as over-simplified, but we also deplore the press activities which made possible these allegations.

* * * * *

Your Committee will continue its investigations of the matters within our commission on Faculty/Trustee relations, and will make reports on these issues, together with its recommendations, at subsequent meetings of the Faculty Assembly.

Reuben E. Wood, Chairman

Wolfgang H. Kraus

James Forrester Davison

Prof. Keeler's report

Mr. Chairman:

Before presenting the Committee's interim report, I should like to make some very brief explanatory comments. First, the facts and judgments to be presented in our short interim report came from many hours of hearings and many pages of stenographic record. Our understanding with those who furnished us with our information was that statements which they made in our hearings would not be attributed to them without specific permission, and we have not thought it desirable to seek such permission.

Second, the interim report which I shall read shortly has not been seen in its final form by Professor Kraus. However, except for very minor modifications and rearrangement of sentences and paragraphs, it is the interim report the three of us agreed to present before he left for Europe early in September. None of us would have written quite this report had he had the full responsibility. Its form and substance represent considerable amount of give and take, but we all agree to it.

Finally, it is an interim report in that it presents a summary of our findings on the matter of the selection of our new president but does not, with one exception, present recommendations. One of the reasons that these recommendations are not included is simply that we have not yet had time to consider carefully what they should be. But in my judgment there is an additional good reason.

Almost always there are many proposals that might be made for achieving an agreed-upon end. The best proposals will fit the circumstances in which they are made. The University has a new president-elect and the Board of Trustees has a new Chairman.

We shall know better how to pursue our purposes when we have become a little acquainted with these new administrations. I would not propose any lengthy delay in formulating recommendations. But I would hope and we shall all hope and watch, during whatever delay there may be, for actions taken by the Board and by the new University administration which will themselves improve Faculty-Trustee relationships and perhaps, in so doing, will ease the task of this committee in formulating its recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I now proceed to read the Committee's Interim Report.

Deduction

1

Mr. Chairman:

Before presenting the Committee's ^{interim} report I should like ~~very briefly~~ to make some very brief explanatory comments. First, the facts and judgments to be presented in our ~~short interim~~ ^{page} report come from many hours of hearings and many pages of stenographic record. Our understanding with those who furnished us with our information was that ~~they would not be~~ statements which they made in our hearings would not be attributed to them without specific permission, and we have not thought it desirable to seek such permission.

Second, the ^{interim} report which ~~we~~ shall ^{read shortly} ~~present today~~ has not been seen in its final form by Professor Kraus. However except for

very minor modifications and rearrangement of sentences and paragraphs, it is the interim report the three of us agreed to present before he left for Europe early in September. None of us would have written quite this report had he had the full responsibility. Its form and substance represent ^a considerable amount of give and take, but we all agree to it.

Finally, it is an interim report in that it ~~does not~~ presents ~~the one finding~~ a summary of our findings on the matter of the selection of our new president but does not, ^{with one exception,} present recommendations. One of the reasons that ^{these} recommendations are not included is simply that we have not yet had time

~~to give careful consideration to~~
~~it~~

to consider carefully what they should be. ~~Another~~ But in my judgment there is ~~two~~ an ~~related~~ additional good reason ~~that~~

Almost always there are many proposals that might be made for achieving an agreed-upon end. The best proposals will fit the circumstances in which they are made. The University has a new president^{elect} and the Board of Trustees has a new chairman.

~~It seems advantageous to let~~
~~a little~~

We shall know better how to ~~approach our~~ ~~our~~ ~~purpose~~ ~~dealing with our~~ pursue our purposes when we have become a little acquainted with these

new administrations. I would not propose any lengthy delay in formulating recommendations. ~~But I would hope, and we shall be and we shall~~ all ~~watch~~ hope and watch, ~~for~~ during whatever delay there may be, for actions taken by the Board and by the new University administration which ~~would lessen the need for~~ ~~to make unnecessary some~~ ~~possible recommendations and~~ ~~would improve the outlook~~ ~~facilitate the formulation of~~ ~~for~~

will themselves improve Faculty - Trustee relationships and perhaps, in so doing ^{will ease} ~~make~~ the task of this committee in formulating its recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I now proceed to read the Committee's Interim Report.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Concerning the Causes of the Differences of Opinion
Between the Faculty and the Board of Trustees in a
Number of Matters including the Selection of a New
President for the University

I

Within a week of the meeting of June 7, 1965, President Colclough appointed Professor James Forrester Davison, in place of Professor Roderic H. Davison who was out of the country, to complete the group of three members of this special committee. The Committee got under way at once and decided to interview as many people as possible who had been connected with the selection of a new president first.

The Committee interviewed six members of the Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees in the Selection of a President, and the Chairman wrote to the other four members and asked them if they had any information they cared to give to us. In several instances, it was indicated that the former members of the Faculty Committee did not care to communicate any information to us. The Committee also interviewed Acting President O. S. Colclough, the new Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. E. K. Morris, and the new Vice Chairman, Mr. Charles K. Phillips, two alumni members of the Board of Trustees, Deans Linton, Burns, and John A. Brown and the President-designate Lloyd H. Elliott. This involved interviews with fifteen persons and the interviews ranged from one to three hours. In two instances, two persons were interviewed on the same occasion and were able to supplement one another's reactions. The Committee did not interview the former Chairman of the Board, Mr. Newell Ellison, nor the former Vice Chairman, Mr. Benjamin McKelway.

While the commission given to this Committee includes all recent issues on which the Board of Trustees and the Faculty have differed, because of its importance, the Committee concentrated on the work of the Faculty Committee and the Board of Trustees Committee for the selection of a new president for the University. In three instances, the Committee did discuss briefly with persons being interviewed the question of the AAUP minimum salary scale and the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics of the Senate. Both of these Faculty recommendations were rejected by the Board of Trustees. If there is time, it is hoped that more information on these subjects may be obtained from persons connected with the Trustees' decisions. Individual members of the Committee also checked personally certain details of time, dates and texts of ^{report} relative written material with other persons who had personal information in detail on these matters. This checking was done to verify information received in our former interviews.

Our special committee has reached the conclusion that the procedure for advising and consulting between Faculty and Board of Trustees did not prove adequate to achieve the purposes which the Faculty had in mind in these cases. The following state in summary form the basis for these conclusions:

1) There were infrequent meetings between the Trustees Committee and the Faculty Committee; one in October, one in April, one semi-formal meeting in May, one formal meeting in May and two formal meetings in June. Communication was maintained between the two committees through the Chairman of the Board of Trustees who was also the Chairman of the Board Committee. As stated below, this communication TURNED OUT TO BE QUITE INADEQUATE for the purposes.

2) There was a lack of agreed-upon criteria to be followed by the two committees in seeking candidates for the presidency of the University. The Faculty Committee had on its part early submitted certain general principles which it regarded as helpful for such a purpose. Yet there never was any explicit response to this from the Trustees Committee, either in terms of acceptance or rejection. While the proposed criteria were rather broad, they nonetheless had the virtue of facilitating communication in this process.

3) There was a lack of any formal agreement or understanding between the two Committees as to how much weight was to be given to expressions of approval or disapproval of particular candidates on the part of the Faculty Committee. While the Faculty Committee had at all times a perfectly clear understanding concerning the Board's legal authority in this matter, it had reason to assume that its reasoned disapproval would contribute a major obstacle to the selection of a particular candidate by the Board. Without such an assumption, its function could hardly be regarded as meaningful by either the ^{Faculty} Trustees Committee or the Faculty which had established it. Furthermore, the last president of the University, the late Dr. Carroll, had been selected with the full approval of another similar committee, even prior to the adoption of the Faculty Code. Finally, one candidate who had been regarded as very strong by the Board Chairman had been dropped after the Faculty Committee had set forth its strong reasons for objecting to this particular individual.

4) Our review of the relationships between the two committees made it quite clear that during the May/June period the communications from the Chairman of the Board to the Faculty Committee were distinctly lacking in candor. In view of the fundamental requirement of good faith throughout this whole process, this introduced a disturbing element of uncertainty and distrust into the last stage of the selection process.

5) The inability of the Faculty Committee to obtain from the Board Committee, or its Chairman, meaningful information as to the process of selection for at least six months, adversely affected the Faculty Committee's relations with the Faculty as a whole and with many University administrators. While the information on a large number of suitable names was available for several months, the process of selection appeared to have come to a dead end early in the month of May.

6) As a result of the lack of any reports from the Faculty Committee indicating continuing positive action in the process of selection, a number of individual communications out of channels were made by faculty members to the Board of Trustees. It would appear that for the same reason, the first Deans and Chairmen's memorandum to the Board of Trustees, dated May 8th, 1965 was communicated directly to the Board rather than through the Faculty Committee. While these actions were undertaken by the participants from a deep concern for the welfare of the University, they had the unintended side-effect that, from the point of view of some members of the Faculty Committee, they appeared to diminish the authority of that Committee; while in the eyes of some members of the Board, they were undesirable manifestations of group pressures within the Faculty.

INSERTION FOR PART I

26 Aug.
recd from Guy
Harris on phone.

7) A word is in order about the role of the Washington Press in all this. At critical stages in the selection process, both immediately before the Board of Trustees made its choice and on several occasions since, local newspapers have displayed a disquieting lack of responsibility both in terms of allegedly factual reporting and of highly biased editorial comment.

The issues involved have been misrepresented with the result that interested members of the Washington community have received a highly distorted view of the University situation. Since the connection between key members of the Board of Trustees with the two leading Washington papers is widely known, this has unfortunately lent, in the eyes of many, a certain plausibility to the view that these papers have allowed themselves to be used as tools in a power struggle between the Trustees and the Faculty of The George Washington University.

We deplore this view as rather over-simplified, but (we deplore) even more the press activities which have given rise to such allegations, both for the sake of the University and the community which it serves.

II

Your Committee is continuing its investigations of a number of matters which appear to be of general concern in faculty-trustee relationships. These may be stated in summary form as follows:

1) The members of the Faculty Committee did not share the same view as to their proper role in the selection process. Some were of the opinion that they were delegates empowered to use their own best judgment in entire independence, while others were more disposed to see themselves as the elected representatives of the Faculty who were in some measure expected to maintain some degree of communication without, however, jeopardizing the delicate selection process by indiscretion. While this was not a problem in the early stages of the process, the difference in conception no doubt eventually assumed some practical relevance for the work and the solidarity of the Faculty Committee. It might be observed that this is not a question which can be resolved in a single or unequivocal manner. Within his legitimate understanding of the Committee's function, one or another member of the Faculty Committee may possibly have communicated more than some of his colleagues desired. There is no indication that the selection process was adversely affected in this fashion.

2. There is, on the other hand, considerable evidence suggesting that certain conversations conducted by members of the Board Committee, more especially by the Chairman of the Board, with a variety of persons during the critical months tended to reflect adversely on the image of the University in educational circles.

3. This Committee's discussions with certain members of the Board and of the University Administration brought out the existence of major and relevant differences in the use of language and of value judgments between the Faculty representatives and the Board. This had much bearing on the effectiveness of the selection process. Without more continuing and diversified contacts between the two groups, it was

probably vain to expect a genuine mutual understanding to result from a limited number of rather formal communications. The selection of a president is in itself a rare and uncommon event with which neither side is apt to have had much experience.

What would have been a delicate and difficult task under the most favorable conditions became hazardous and led to an unnecessary deadlock, partly because of the failure ~~of~~ in reaching a genuine understanding from the outset.

4. In order to avoid the recurrence of such a situation, efforts must be made to enter into a more meaningful dialogue between Faculty representatives and the Board on all matters of mutual concern. Whether, in addition to this, a textual revision of the Faculty Code provisions concerning the election of a President and a Dean of Faculties is desirable will be given further study by your Committee. A further report should be laid before you at a later date.

5. As indicated above, the principal issue discussed by this Committee with the persons interviewed had to do with the procedures for the selection of a new President. Two other disagreements occurred during the same period between the Senate Committees and the Board of Trustees. These had to do with a) a recommendation that the Board adopt the principle of an early improvement in Faculty salaries to bring the University scale within the range of the second category of the AAUP minimum standards, and b) the Special Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics of the University Senate's recommendation to curtail the heavy expense of intercollegiate football in order to conserve the University's financial resources for other recreational purposes. The Board Committee recommended the extension of the University's football activities and at the same time extension of other recreational and athletic facilities and events. In our discussion of these two items with Trustees, it appeared that there are economic questions and educational policy questions which require a further study and particularly an application of some better basis for understanding as indicated in Paragraph 2) immediately above.

Your Committee has reached the conclusion that it would be in the best interests of the University to invite an impartial outside agency to provide us with a fresh analysis of these policy problems in the light of the broadest available experience. Hence we recommend that a top-ranking consultants in the field of higher education be invited to consider these questions and present their report to the Faculty and the Board.

6. Similarly, it is our belief that recent experience suggests that it might greatly benefit the Board of Trustees and the University at large to invite such a group of educational consultants to analyse and evaluate the procedures of the Board and the pattern of relationships between the Board, the Administration and the Faculty and to submit some appropriate findings and recommendations. The type of consultant we have in mind might be illustrated by the name of Dr. Herman Wells, until recently President of the University of Indiana, a distinguished educator who is at present concerned with the study of the University of Pittsburg.

2) There was a lack of agreed-upon criteria to be followed by the two committees in seeking candidates for the presidency of the University. The Faculty Committee had on its part early submitted certain general principles which it regarded as helpful for such a purpose. Yet there never was any explicit response to this from the Trustees Committee, either in terms of acceptance or rejection. While the proposed criteria were rather broad, they nonetheless had the virtue of facilitating communication in this process.

3) There was a lack of any formal agreement or understanding between the two Committees as to how much weight was to be given to expressions of approval or disapproval of particular candidates on the part of the Faculty Committee. While the Faculty Committee had at all times a perfectly clear understanding concerning the Board's legal authority in this matter, it had reason to assume that its reasoned disapproval² would contribute a major obstacle to the selection of a particular candidate by the Board. Without such an assumption, its function could hardly be regarded as meaningful by either the ^{Faculty} Trustees Committee or the Faculty which had established it. Furthermore, the last president of the University, the late Dr. Carroll, had been selected with the full approval of another similar committee, even prior to the adoption of the Faculty Code. Finally, one candidate who had been regarded as very strong by the Board Chairman had been dropped after the Faculty Committee had set forth its strong reasons for objecting to this particular individual.

4) Our review of the relationships between the two committees made it quite clear that during the May/June period the communications from the Chairman of the Board to the Faculty Committee were distinctly lacking in candor. In view of the fundamental requirement of good faith throughout this whole process, this introduced a disturbing element of uncertainty and distrust into the last stage of the selection process.

5) The inability of the Faculty Committee to obtain from the Board Committee, or its Chairman, meaningful information as to the process of selection for at least six months, adversely affected the Faculty Committee's relations with the Faculty as a whole and with many University administrators. While the information on a large number of suitable names was available for several months, the process of selection appeared to have come to a dead end early in the month of May.

6) As a result of the lack of any reports from the Faculty Committee indicating continuing positive action in the process of selection, a number of individual communications out of channels were made by faculty members to the Board of Trustees. It would appear that for the same reason, the first Deans and Chairmen's memorandum to the Board of Trustees, dated May 8th, 1965 was communicated directly to the Board rather than through the Faculty Committee. While these actions were undertaken by the participants from a deep concern for the welfare of the University, they had the unintended side-effect that, from the point of view of some members of the Faculty Committee, they appeared to diminish the authority of that Committee; while in the eyes of some members of the Board, they were undesirable manifestations of group pressures within the Faculty.

II

Your Committee is continuing its investigations of a number of matters which appear to be of general concern in faculty-trustee relationships. These may be stated in summary form as follows:

1) The members of the Faculty Committee did not share the same view as to their proper role in the selection process. Some were of the opinion that they were delegates empowered to use their own best judgment in entire independence, while others were more disposed to see themselves as the elected representatives of the Faculty who were in some measure expected to maintain some degree of communication without, however, jeopardizing the delicate selection process by indiscretion. While this was not a problem in the early stages of the process, the difference in conception no doubt eventually assumed some practical relevance for the work and the solidarity of the Faculty Committee. It might be observed that this is not a question which can be resolved in a single or unequivocal manner. Within his legitimate understanding of the Committee's function, one or another member of the Faculty Committee may possibly have communicated more than some of his colleagues desired. There is no indication that the selection process was adversely affected in this fashion.

2. There is, on the other hand, considerable evidence suggesting that certain conversations conducted by members of the Board Committee, more especially by the Chairman of the Board, with a variety of persons during the critical months tended to reflect adversely on the image of the University in educational circles.

3. This Committee's discussions with certain members of the Board and of the University Administration brought out the existence of major and relevant differences in the use of language and of value judgments between the Faculty representatives and the Board. This had much bearing on the effectiveness of the selection process. Without more continuing and diversified contacts between the two groups, it was

probably vain to expect a genuine mutual understanding to result from a limited number of rather formal communications. The selection of a president is in itself a rare and uncommon event with which neither side is apt to have had much experience.

What would have been a delicate and difficult task under the most favorable conditions became hazardous and led to an unnecessary deadlock, partly because of the failure ~~of~~ in reaching a genuine understanding from the outset.

4. In order to avoid the recurrence of such a situation, efforts must be made to enter into a more meaningful dialogue between Faculty representatives and the Board on all matters of mutual concern. Whether, in addition to this, a textual revision of the Faculty Code provisions concerning the election of a President and a Dean of Faculties is desirable will be given further study by your Committee. A further report should be laid before you at a later date.

5. As indicated above, the principal issue discussed by this Committee with the persons interviewed had to do with the procedures for the selection of a new President. Two other disagreements occurred during the same period between the Senate Committees and the Board of Trustees. These had to do with a) a recommendation that the Board adopt the principle of an early improvement in Faculty salaries to bring the University scale within the range of the second category of the AAUP minimum standards, and b) the Special Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics of the University Senate's recommendation to curtail the heavy expense of intercollegiate football in order to conserve the University's financial resources for other recreational purposes. The Board Committee recommended the extension of the University's football activities and at the same time extension of other recreational and athletic facilities and events. In our discussion of these two items with Trustees, it appeared that there are economic questions and educational policy questions which require a further study and particularly an application of some better basis for understanding as indicated in Paragraph 2) immediately above.

Your Committee has reached the conclusion that it would be in the best interests of the University to invite an impartial outside agency to provide us with a fresh analysis of these policy problems in the light of the broadest available experience. Hence we recommend that ~~a~~ top-ranking consultants in the field of higher education be invited to consider these questions and present their report to the Faculty and the Board.

6. Similarly, it is our belief that recent experience suggests that it might greatly benefit the Board of Trustees and the University at large to invite such a group of educational consultants to analyse and evaluate the procedures of the Board and the pattern of relationships between the Board, the Administration and the Faculty and to submit some appropriate findings and recommendations. The type of consultant we have in mind might be illustrated by the name of Dr. Herman Wells, until recently President of the University of Indiana, a distinguished educator who is at present concerned with the study of the University of Pittsburg.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

We are reminded of a story recounted in the Book of Kings. Two women, each having recently given birth, were brought before King Solomon with one child. The other had died. Both claimed the living child. The king said, "Fetch me a sword." And they brought a sword before the King. and the King said, "Divide the living child in two, and give half to the one and half to the other." Then spake the woman whose the living child was unto the King, for her heart yearned over her son, and she said, "Oh my lord, give her the living child and in no wise slay it."

Many members of the faculty and the members of this committee find themselves somewhat in the position of the mother of the living child. Let no one mistake responsibility for timidity nor forbearance for weakness. Nor let the faculty's loyalty to and affection for the University which many have served long and faithfully be in doubt. Rather let it be recognized that our concern for the welfare of The George Washington University constrains our expressions of what we view as justified protests and our assertions of what we view as justifiable claims.

With this constraint, this committee has tried to find and present the relevant facts with the minimum of disparagement of or attribution of blame, specifically to individuals. However, a better future is made probable by the recognition of mistakes and faults of the past. Some fault-finding has therefore seemed a requisite part of this report. As the first part of our analysis, we shall examine some of the pressures and difficulties under which various groups and individuals importantly involved in the presidential selection process worked. These are relevant for their own sake and also in many cases tend to mitigate the blame to be placed on groups or individuals for actions which in retrospect seem ill-advised.

First, the Faculty Advisory Committee on the Selection of a President worked tirelessly between the time of its election and the time of President Elliott's election. The very large amount of time and effort its members devoted to the committee's work were in addition to their regular academic duties. The Faculty Advisory Committee's work was made harder by the fact that it did not at all times receive full cooperation from the Trustees. For example, in our opinion, the Faculty Committee's request for more frequent meetings with the selection committee of the Trustees - not only with

Mr. Ellison - should, in the interests of more effective and efficient procedure, have been granted. It was not. The faculty owes much to the members of the Advisory Committee for their conscientious service. Nor were all their efforts in vain. The committee selected from long lists ^{those} /candidates worthy of serious consideration. In one or more instances, it persuaded the Trustees that a candidate favored by the Trustees would probably not make an acceptable president and the candidate was dropped from further serious consideration.

Moreover, in spite of its difficulties and of the Trustees' rejection of its final recommendation, it seems probable that the Faculty Advisory Committee by the orderliness of its procedures and the thoroughness with which it conducted its investigations enhanced the reputation of the faculty as a body able to participate responsibly in processes of University decision-making beyond any narrowly-defined areas of educational policy.

Like the faculty committee, Chairman Ellison gave much time and energy to the presidential selection. He did this while in addition to the demands of his non-university activities, he was bearing the burden of a great personal tragedy.

Although all concerned closely in the presidential selection process were under increasing pressures both to arrive at some decision and also to arrive at this or that particular decision, probably this pressure fell most heavily on Chairman Ellison and other members of the Board of Trustees. We know that many, if not all, of the trustees were continually recipients of oral or written communications pressing for a decision in favor of a particular candidate, or at least a prompt decision of some sort. In our view, this pressure was a very important factor leading to the Trustee's decision of June 5, 1965, to reject the faculty committee's recommendation that the search be continued.

Members of the faculty and various faculty groups were, themselves, under a kind of increasing pressure. They saw acute needs for the development of the University and the rising urgency of selecting a president who could participate in both short-range and long-range plans with the prospect of being the one who would be responsible for carrying out these plans.

On the basis of the facts given in the first part of this report, of some facts that are common knowledge, and with mitigating circumstances just mentioned in mind, we proceed to complete our report with a statement of our conclusions and recommendations.

1. We find that a difference in opinion as to the function and authority of the Faculty Advisory Committee existed among its members. Some members seemed to feel that - stated roughly - their responsibility was to reflect and advocate what they understood to be the majority view of the faculty. Others felt that the Advisory Committee should operate independently and be responsible to the body which had established the Committee only in the obligation to do those things which in the Committee's judgment would lead to the best result for the faculty and the University. Our opinion is that the proper function of a faculty advisory committee fits more nearly with the independent agency idea. Much of such a committee's work must be confidential. Much of it involves diplomacy and tact in dealing with trustees and candidates. It is for reasons such as these that a small committee rather than the faculty as a whole is the necessary kind of instrument to participate in the presidential selection process and it is for reasons such as these that the committee must have much autonomy. We recommend that in the future, the autonomous nature of such a committee be clearly understood by the faculty and by the committee members.

2. In our judgment, the sending to the Trustees of a petition relative to the presidential selection by deans and department heads was ill-advised, and tended to undercut the authority of the Faculty Advisory Committee. If it had any effect at all on the outcome of the selection process, it was a self-defeating effect. All those deans and the department heads are voting members of the Faculty Assembly. Not only in matters of presidential selection, but in all cases where it is an appropriate agency, we urge individual faculty members, the several faculties, the heads of departments, the deans and other administrative officers, to support and work through the University Faculty Organization.

3. We have already stated our belief that more joint meetings of the Committee

to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees on the Selection of a President and the ~~Trustees~~ Committee of the Board of Trustees to Recommend a New President for The George Washington University would have improved matters. On the question of what other changes in procedure might be beneficial, we defer further comment in the expectation that the final report of the Faculty Advisory Committee will make appropriate recommendations. On the topic of communication, however, we have something to say. We are glad to report that the Trustees with whom we have talked and also President Elliott have put themselves on record as favoring greater communication between the faculty and the trustees. In order for such communication to be effective, the Faculty must understand the Trustees, the Trustees the faculty, and both must understand the nature of a University. A barrier to these understandings is suggested by an ex^cerpt from the letter David Selznick wrote to John Huston telling him that he was fired as director of the movie, "Farewell to Arms." Selznick said, "There cannot be two individualists in any project. There can be only one. And under my obligations and by my training, this can be only myself." It may well be that because of their training, and confronted by their obligations, to some of the Trustees it is an extremely awkward and not completely comprehended fact that a University worthy of the name is a "project" in which there must be many individualists. Some faculty members, on the other hand, while understanding this fact about the university, may not appreciate the extent to which in certain areas of the operation of the university, this individualism must give place to mutual effort and a considerable measure of conformity in support of established policy and objectives. We recommend that the greater communication, which everyone favors, be implemented both by the establishment of adequate channels and by efforts on the part of the Trustees and the Faculty to understand each other and the institution which they both serve.

4. We reluctantly conclude that the chairman of the Trustees Selection Committee did not at all times deal with that committee and with others with candor. In particular, it is our judgment that his assertion at various times to

the effect that Dean John Anthony Brown was, or was still among the leading candidates was at best meaningless. We are convinced that probably early and certainly by the later stages of the presidential search, Dean Brown had such powerful opposition on the Board that the possibility of his election was exceedingly remote. We feel that the candid acknowledgment of this fact should have been made to those concerned, particularly to the Faculty Advisory Committee.

We must also, and also reluctantly, question the propriety of the letter dated June 1 and mailed on June 2 by the Chairman to some of the Trustees stating in effect that Lloyd Elliott would almost certainly be proposed for election as president of the university at the June 5, 1965 meeting of the Board of Trustees. We question the propriety of this letter because it was written and mailed before the Faculty Committee had submitted its final recommendations in this matter.

5. We find that there were some serious indiscretions and some unfortunate accidents involving unethical, premature or embarrassing distribution of information of a confidential nature. The number of people legitimately in possession of bits and pieces of such information was large. These people included not only members of the Faculty Advisory Committee and members of the Trustees Selection Committee, but prospective candidates, nominators of prospective candidates, individuals of whom one or another kind of inquiry was made concerning possible candidates, deans or other administrators who interviewed some candidates, and even those who, for example, saw a supposed candidate being escorted around the campus. Complete suppression of leaks and of the circulation of guesses which may turn out to be fact is very difficult under these conditions. We can make no more specific recommendation on this matter than that both on the basis of ethics and in the interests of expediency, all involved in a presidential selection operation recognize the great importance of keeping certain kinds of information out of general distribution channels. There is a plausible theory that one promising candidate in the recent search was subjected to pressure to withdraw his name from further consideration and ultimately did

withdraw it as a result of a premature public revelation that he was being
to
seriously considered for election ~~the~~ The George Washington University
presidency.

Analysis and Conclusions

~~The~~

We are reminded of a story recounted in the Book of Kings. Two women, each having recently given birth, were brought before King Solomon with one child. The other had died. Both claimed the living child. The king said "Fetch me a sword." And they brought a sword before the king. And the king said, "Divide the living child in two, and give half to the one and half to the other." Then spake the woman whose the living child was unto the king, for her heart yearned over her son, and she said, "Oh, my lord, give her the living child and in no wise slay it." ~~And the king~~

Many members of the faculty and the members of this committee find themselves somewhat in the position of the mother of the living child. Let no one mistake ~~for~~ responsibility for timidity nor forbearance for weakness. Nor

faculty's
 let the loyalty to and affection
 for the university which many
 have served long and faithfully
 be in doubt. Rather let it be
 recognized that our concern for
 the welfare of the George Washington
 University constrains the our expressions
 of ~~for~~ what we view as justified
 protests ~~and justifiable claims~~
 and our assertions of what we
 view as justifiable claims.

With this ^{constraint} ~~restriction~~, this committee
 has tried to find and present
 the relevant facts ~~without~~ with
 the minimum ~~attribution of~~
 disparagement ~~of blame or~~ or
 attribution of blame specifically
 to individuals. However, ~~the~~
~~best~~ as a better future is
 made probable by the recognition
 of mistakes and faults of the past.
 Some fault-finding has therefore
 seemed a requisite part of this
 report. As the first part of
 our analysis we shall examine
 some of the pressures and difficulties
 under which various groups and
 individuals importantly involved in

the presidential selection process worked. These are relevant for their own sake and also in many cases tend to mitigate the blame ~~that~~ to be placed on groups or individuals for actions which in retrospect seem ill advised.

Insert page 3A here.

First, the Faculty Advisory Committee on the Selection of A President worked tirelessly between the time of its election and the time of President Elliott's election. The very large amount of time and effort its members devoted to the committee's work were in addition to their regular academic duties. ⁴ The faculty owes much to the members of ~~this committee~~ the Advisory Committee for their conscientious service. Nor were all their efforts in vain. The committee selected from long lists candidates ^{those} worthy of serious consideration. In one or more instances it persuaded the Trustees that a candidate favored by the Trustees ~~was~~ would ~~not~~ probably not make an acceptable president and the candidate was dropped from further serious consideration.

was made known. The Faculty Advisory Committee's work
 by the fact that it did not at all times receive
 full cooperation from the Trustees.
 For example, in our opinion the
 Faculty Committee's ~~time~~ ~~expressed~~
 requests ~~desire~~ for more frequent meetings
 with the selection committee of
 the Trustees - not only with Mr. Ellison
~~were~~ ~~were~~ ~~prop~~ ~~was~~ should
~~have been~~ in the interests of
 more effective and efficient procedure,
 have been granted. It was not.

Moreover,

its difficulties and

~~However~~, in spite of the Trustees' rejection of ~~the~~ ^{its} final recommendation, ~~of the advisory~~ Faculty Advisory ^{Committee} ~~committee~~, it seems probable that the ~~the~~ ~~thorough and responsible~~

by the

~~orderly and thorough~~ orderliness of its procedures and the thoroughness with which it conducted its investigations enhanced the reputation of the faculty as a body able to participate responsibly in processes of University decision-making beyond any narrowly-defined areas of educational policy.

Like the faculty committee, Chairman Ellison ~~devoted~~ gave much time and energy to the presidential selection. He did this while in addition to the demands of his ~~business~~ non-university activities he was bearing the burden of a great personal tragedy.

Although all concerned closely in the presidential selection process were under increasing pressures both to arrive at some decision

and also to arrive at ~~one or~~
~~so~~ this or that particular
 decision, probably this pressure
 fell most heavily on Chairman
 Ellison and other members of
 the Board of Trustees. We know
 that many if not all of the
 trustees were continually recipients
 of oral or written communications
~~pressing for a prompt decision~~
 pressing ~~prompt decision~~ for a decision
 in favor of a particular candidate.
 In our view, this pressure was
 a very important factor leading
 to the Trustees' decision of June 5, 1965,
 to reject the faculty committee's
 recommendation that the search
 be continued.

or at least a
 prompt decision
 of some sort.

Members of the faculty and
 various faculty groups were,
 themselves, under a kind of
 increasing pressure. They saw
 acute needs for the development
 of the university and the rising
 urgency of selecting a president
 who could ~~make~~ both short-range and
 plans with the prospect of
 being the one who would ~~be~~ ~~have~~
~~the~~ be responsible for carrying out

participate in
 the making of

these plans.

On the basis of the facts given in the first part of this report, of some facts that are common knowledge, ~~for~~ and with mitigating circumstances just mentioned in mind, we proceed to ~~complete~~ ^{complete} our report with a statement of our conclusions and recommendations.

1. We find that a difference in opinion as to the function and authority of the Faculty Advisory Committee existed among its ~~own~~ members. Some members seemed to feel that - stated roughly - ~~they were, like members of the Electoral College, that~~ their responsibility was to reflect and advocate ~~the~~ what they understood to be the majority view of the ~~Faculty~~ ~~the~~ faculty. ~~an~~ Others felt that the Advisory Committee should operate independently and be responsible to the body which had established the Committee only in the obligation to do those things which in the Committee's judgment would lead to the best result for the faculty and the university. Our ~~judgment~~ ^{opinion} is that the proper function of a faculty advisory committee fits more nearly with the independent agency idea. Much of such a committee's

work must be confidential. Much of it involves diplomacy and tact in dealing with trustees and candidates. It is for reasons such as these that a small committee rather than the faculty as a whole is the necessary kind of instrument ~~to engage in~~ to participate in ~~pass~~ the presidential selection process and it is for reasons such as these that the committee must have ~~large~~ much autonomy. We recommend that in the future the autonomous nature of such a committee be clearly understood by the faculty and by the committee members.

2. In our judgment, the sending to the Trustees of a petition ~~by~~ relative to the presidential selection by ~~the~~ deans and department heads was ill-advised and tended to ~~reduce the~~ undercut the authority of the Faculty Advisory Committee. ~~part of~~ All these deans and ^{the} department heads are voting members of the Faculty Assembly. ~~They are also administrative officers~~ ~~the urge in the interest~~ Not only in matters of presidential selection but in all cases where it is an appropriate agency we urge ~~faculty members~~ ~~department heads~~ individual faculty.

if it had any effect at all on the outcome of the selection process, it was a self-defeating effect.

members, the several faculties, ~~the~~
~~heads~~ the heads of departments, the
 deans and other administrative officers
 to support and work through the
 University Faculty Organization.

^{our belief}
~~our belief~~
 3. We have already ~~stated~~ ^{stated}
 that ~~greater contact~~ more joint
 meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee
 and the Trustees Selection Committee would
 have improved matters. On the
 question of what other changes in
 procedure might be beneficial we
 defer ~~further~~ ~~to the recommendations~~
 further comment in the expectation
 that the final report of the Faculty
 Advisory Committee will ~~not~~ make
 appropriate recommendations. On the
 topic of communication, however,
 we have something to say. We
 are glad to report that the trustees
 with whom we have talked and
 also President Elliott have put
 themselves on record ~~as~~ as favoring
 greater communication between the
 faculty and the trustees. In order
 for such communication to be effective
 the Faculty ~~on its part~~ must understand
 the Trustees, ~~and~~ the Trustees the faculty
 and both must understand the nature of

(get proper
 name)

a university. A barrier to these understandings is suggested by an excerpt from the letter ~~from~~ David Selznick wrote to John Huston telling him that he was fired as director of the movie Farewell to Arms. Selznick said, "There cannot be two individualists in any project. There can be only one. And under my obligations and by my training, this can be only myself." It may well be that ~~because of their~~ ^{of their} ~~by~~ ~~it~~ confronted by their obligations, to some of the Trustees ~~find it~~ ^{is} an extremely awkward ~~fact that~~ and not completely comprehended fact that a university worthy of the name is a "project" in which there must be many individualists. Some faculty members, on the other hand, while understanding this fact about the university, may not appreciate the extent to which in certain areas of the ~~operation~~ ^{operation} of the university this individualism must give place ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~coordinated effort~~ ^{mutual effort} ~~dictated by duly constituted and~~ ^{accepted authority} ~~accepted authority~~ ^{individuals whose} ~~authority~~ ^{under the} ~~dictated by~~ ^{and} and a considerable measure

of conformity in support of established policy and objectives. We recommend

We know of no definitive ^{study} ~~work~~ on the ~~relation~~ ~~among~~ ~~the~~ proper distribution of responsibility between faculty and ~~of~~ trustees in the modern university. Corson's "The Governance of Universities" is an excellent contribution to this ~~subject~~ problem but it raises more questions than it answers. The report of Committee T of the American Association of University Professors is also excellent source material. As a very relevant activity, ~~we recommend that and~~ and as an ~~activity~~ instance of the increased communications which everyone favors, ~~and in the~~ we recommend that a joint ~~study~~ by trustees, ~~and faculty representatives~~ ~~administrative~~ officers and ~~faculty~~ representatives of the Faculty Organization ~~be undertaken~~

that the greater communication, which everyone favors, be implemented both by the establishment of ~~additional channels~~ adequate channels and by efforts on the part of the Trustees and the Faculty to understand each other and the institution which they both serve.

4. ~~Lack of candor~~ conclude that the
 4. We reluctantly ~~find~~ the chairman of the trustees ~~at~~ selection committee did not at all times deal with that committee and with others with candor. In particular it is our judgment that his assertion at various times to the effect that Dean John Anthony Brown was ^{or was still} among the leading candidates was at best meaningless. We are convinced that probably early and certainly by the later stages of the presidential search Dean Brown had ~~for~~ such powerful opposition on the Board that the possibility of his election was exceedingly remote. We feel that the candid acknowledgment of this fact should have been made

to those concerned, particularly to the Faculty Advisory Committee.

~~question~~ We must also, and also reluctantly, question the propriety of the letter dated June 1 and mailed on June 2 by the Chairman to some of the trustees stating ~~that~~ in effect that Lloyd Elliott would almost certainly be proposed for election as president of the university at the June 5, 1965 meeting of the ~~Board of~~ Trustees. We question the propriety of this letter because it was written and mailed before the Faculty Committee had submitted its final recommendations in this matter.

5. We find that there were some serious ~~breaches of~~ indiscretions ~~in~~ and some unfortunate accidents involving ~~unethical, premature or embarrassing information~~ unethical, premature or embarrassing distribution of information of a confidential nature. The number of people ^{legitimately} in possession of bits and pieces of such information ~~as far~~ was large. These people included not only members of the Faculty Advisory Committee and members of the Trustees' Selection Committee, but prospective candidates, nominators of prospective candidates, individuals of whom one or another kind of inquiry was made concerning possible candidates, deans or other administrators who interviewed some candidates, and even

for example,

a supposed

those who saw ~~that~~ candidate
being escorted around the campus.

~~Complete suppression of leaks and of the circulation of~~
~~this report of~~ guesses which may turn out to
be fact is very difficult under these conditions.

We can make no ~~other~~ more
specific recommendation on this
matter than that both ~~from~~
~~the point of~~ on the basis of
ethics and in the interests of
expediency all involved in ~~the~~
~~selection~~ a presidential selection
operation recognize the great
importance of keeping certain
kinds of information out of general
distribution channels. There is
a plausible theory that ~~in the~~
~~case of~~ one promising candidate
in the recent search was subjected
to pressure to withdraw his
name from further consideration
and ultimately did withdraw it
as a result of a premature public
revelation that he was being seriously
considered for election to the U.S. presidency.

Sept 13 1965

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY
OF THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Interim Report on the Matter of the
Selection of the New President of
the University

At its special meeting on June 7, 1965, the Faculty Assembly passed this resolution:

"That the Faculty Assembly appoint a committee consisting of Professor Reuben E. Wood, Chairman, and Professors Wolfgang H. Kraus and Roderic H. Davison, former chairmen of the Executive Committee of the University Senate, to ascertain the facts in all cases in which the Board of Trustees have not seen fit or do not see fit to follow the recommendations of the Faculty Assembly or the University Senate and, with all reasonable speed to report its findings and recommendations to the Faculty Assembly."

Within a week of the meeting of June 7, 1965, President Golclough appointed Professor James Forrester Davison as pro tempore member of the Committee to serve in place of Professor Roderic H. Davison who was out of the country. The present interim report is the first report of this standing committee.

The commission given to this Committee includes all recent issues on which the Board of Trustees and the Faculty have differed. Specifically, these issues are: (1) The matter of the Senate resolution on faculty salaries, (2) the matter of the Senate-adopted report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics and (3) the matter of the selection of the new president of the University.

Some facts have been collected concerning the first two items, but the Committee felt that its most urgent assignment was the investigation of the presidential selection process, and it concentrated its efforts on this investigation. The other two items will be the subject of future study and reports. The remainder of this report concerns the selection of the new president. Here we shall present findings of fact and shall, with one exception, defer our recommendations to a subsequent report.

The Committee interviewed six members of the Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees in the Selection of a President, and the Chairman

wrote to the other four members and asked them if they had any information they cared to give to us. In several instances, it was indicated that the former members of the Faculty Committee did not care to communicate any information to us. The Committee also interviewed Acting President O. S. Colclough, the new Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. E. K. Morris, and the new Vice Chairman, Mr. Charles K. Phillips, two alumni members of the Board of Trustees, Deans Linton, Burns, and John A. Brown and the President-designate Lloyd H. Elliott.

We were received with a great showing of cooperation. ^{There were} ~~This involved~~ interviews with fifteen persons and the interviews ranged from one to three hours. ^{in cases over the whole} In two instances, two persons were interviewed on the same occasion and were able to supplement one another's reactions. ^{If} The Committee did not interview the former Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Newell Ellison, nor the former Vice Chairman, Mr. Benjamin McKelway.

Individual members of the Committee also checked certain details of time and dates and texts of relevant written material with other persons who had detailed information on these matters. This checking was done to amplify and verify information received in our formal interviews.

This Committee has reached the conclusion that the procedure for advising and consulting between Faculty and Board of Trustees did not provide an adequate opportunity for exploring issues with the Board, for supporting the Faculty position, and for achieving a meeting of minds.

The following paragraphs state in summary form the basis for this conclusion:

- 1) There were infrequent meetings between the Trustees Committee and the Faculty Committee; one in October, one in April, one semi-formal meeting in May, one formal meeting in May and two formal meetings in June. Communication was maintained between the two committees through the Chairman of the Board of Trustees

who was also the Chairman of the Board Committee. This communication, we feel, was inadequate.

2) There was a lack of agreed-upon criteria to be followed by the two committees in seeking candidates for the presidency of the University. The Faculty Committee had on its part early submitted certain general principles which it regarded as helpful for such a purpose. Yet there never was any explicit response to this from the Trustees Committee, either in terms of acceptance or rejection. While the proposed criteria were rather broad, they nonetheless should have had the virtue of facilitating communication in this process.

3) There was a lack of any formal agreement or understanding between the two Committees as to how much weight was to be given to expressions of approval or disapproval of particular candidates on the part of the Faculty Committee. While the Faculty Committee had at all times a perfectly clear understanding concerning the full legal authority of the Board in this matter, it assumed that any reasoned disapproval on its part would contribute a major obstacle to the selection of a particular candidate by the Board, at least until that obstacle had been cleared. Without such an assumption, its function could hardly be regarded as meaningful by the Faculty Committee or the Faculty which had established it. The last President of the University, the late Dr. Carroll, had been selected with the full approval of another Faculty Committee, even prior to the adoption of the Faculty Code. This fact could be considered a significant precedent. Moreover, one candidate in the present search who had been regarded as most acceptable by the Board Chairman had been dropped after the Faculty Committee had set forth to the Chairman its strong reasons for objecting to this particular individual.

4) Our review of the relationships between the two committees made it clear that during the May/June period, the communications from the Chairman of the Board to the Faculty Committee were lacking in candor. In view of the fundamental

requirement of good faith throughout this whole process, this lack introduced a disturbing element of uncertainty and distrust into the last stage of the selection process. We have also learned that Dr. Elliott was offered ^{and accepted} the presidency of The George Washington University without disclosure of the adverse recommendation of the Faculty Advisory Committee. We believe that his acceptance of this position under such circumstances put him in a very embarrassing position both in Maine and in Washington, D. C. for which he was ^{primarily} not responsible. We recommend that the Faculty welcome Dr. Lloyd Elliott as the new President of The George Washington University.

5) The inability of the Faculty Committee to obtain from the Board Committee or its Chairman for the first four months meaningful information as to the candidates under active consideration, was the result of inaction by the Board Committee. It also affected adversely the Faculty Committee's role and made it appear to be somewhat of an outsider in the selection process. While the information on a number of names was available in the winter for several months, ^{progress in} the process of selection appeared to have come to a dead end early in the month of May.

6) The lack of indications to the Faculty from its Committee, to show continuing positive action in the process of selection, stimulated individual communications to the Board of Trustees, out of channels, by Faculty members. It would appear that the first memorandum from the Deans and Chairmen to the Board of Trustees dated May 8, 1965 was communicated directly to the Board rather than through the Faculty Committee for much the same reasons. While these actions were undertaken by members of the University moved by a deep concern for the welfare of the University, they had some unintended side effects; a) from the point of view of some of those persons primarily concerned in the selection process, they appeared to diminish the authority of the Faculty Committee, and b) in the eyes of some members of the Board of Trustees, they appeared to be manifestations of improper group pressures from the Faculty.

7) A word is in order about the role of the Washington press in this process. At critical stages both before the Board of Trustees made its choice, and on several occasions afterward, the local newspapers displayed a disquieting lack of responsibility which was shown in possibly unavoidable inadequacy in factual reporting and in distorted editorial comment. The issues involved have been misrepresented with the result that interested members of the Washington community have received a highly distorted view of the University's situation.

Inasmuch as the connection between key members of the University Board of Trustees and the two leading Washington newspapers is widely known, this relationship has unfortunately lent in the eyes of some persons a certain plausibility to the view that these papers allowed themselves to be used as an instrument in the relations between the Trustees and the Faculty of The George Washington University. We deplore this view as over-simplified, but we also deplore the press activities which made possible these allegations.

* * * * *

Your Committee will continue its investigations of the matters within our commission on Faculty/Trustee relations, and will make reports on these issues, together with its recommendations, at subsequent meetings of the Faculty Assembly.

Reuben E. Wood, Chairman

Wolfgang H. Kraus

James Forrester Davison

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY
OF THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Interim Report on the Matter of the
Selection of the New President of
the University

*Later Revision
to this (2 pages)
Substituted
September 15, 1965*

At its special meeting on June 7, 1965, the Faculty Assembly passed this resolution:

"That the Faculty Assembly appoint a committee consisting of Professor Reuben E. Wood, Chairman, and Professor Wolfgang H. Kraus and Roderic H. Davison, former chairmen of the Executive Committee of the University Senate, to ascertain the facts in all cases in which the Board of Trustees have not seen fit or do not see fit to follow the recommendations of the Faculty Assembly or the University Senate and, with all reasonable speed to report its findings and recommendations to the Faculty Assembly."

Within a week of the meeting of June 7, 1965, President Golclough appointed Professor James Forrester Davison as pro tempore member of the Committee to serve in place of Professor Roderic H. Davison who was out of the country. The present interim report is the first report of this standing committee.

The commission given to this Committee includes all recent issues on which the Board of Trustees and the Faculty have differed. Specifically, these issues are: (1) The matter of the Senate resolution on faculty salaries, (2) the matter of the Senate-adopted report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics and (3) the matter of the selection of the new president of the University.

Some facts have been collected concerning the first two items, but the Committee felt that its most urgent assignment was the investigation of the presidential selection process, and it concentrated its efforts on this investigation. The other two items will be the subject of future study and reports. The remainder of this report concerns the selection of the new president. Here we shall present findings of fact and shall, with one exception, defer our recommendations to a subsequent report.

The Committee interviewed six members of the Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees in the Selection of a President, and the Chairman

wrote to the other four members and asked them if they had any information they cared to give to us. In several instances, it was indicated that the former members of the Faculty Committee did not care to communicate any information to us. The Committee also interviewed Acting President O. S. Colclough, the new Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. E. K. Morris, and the new Vice Chairman, Mr. Charles K. Phillips, two alumni members of the Board of Trustees, Deans Linton, Burns, and John A. Brown and the President-designate Lloyd H. Elliott. We were received with a great showing of cooperation. This involved interviews with fifteen persons and the interviews ranged from one to three hours. In two instances, two persons were interviewed on the same occasion and were able to supplement one another's reactions. The Committee did not interview the former Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Newell Ellison, nor the former Vice Chairman, Mr. Benjamin McKelway.

Individual members of the Committee also checked certain details of time and dates and texts of relevant written material with other persons who had detailed information on these matters. This checking was done to amplify and verify information received in our formal interviews.

This Committee has reached the conclusion that the procedure for advising and consulting between Faculty and Board of Trustees did not provide an adequate opportunity for exploring issues with the Board, for supporting the Faculty position, and for achieving a meeting of minds.

The following paragraphs state in summary form the basis for this conclusion:

- 1) There were infrequent meetings between the Trustees Committee and the Faculty Committee; one in October, one in April, one semi-formal meeting in May, one formal meeting in May and two formal meetings in June. Communication was maintained between the two committees through the Chairman of the Board of Trustees

who was also the Chairman of the Board Committee. This communication, we feel, was inadequate.

2) There was a lack of agreed-upon criteria to be followed by the two committees in seeking candidates for the presidency of the University. The Faculty Committee had on its part early submitted certain general principles which it regarded as helpful for such a purpose. Yet there never was any explicit response to this from the Trustees Committee, either in terms of acceptance or rejection. While the proposed criteria were rather broad, they nonetheless should have had the virtue of facilitating communication in this process.

3) There was a lack of any formal agreement or understanding between the two Committees as to how much weight was to be given to expressions of approval or disapproval of particular candidates on the part of the Faculty Committee. While the Faculty Committee had at all times a perfectly clear understanding concerning the full legal authority of the Board in this matter, it assumed that any reasoned disapproval on its part would contribute a major obstacle to the selection of a particular candidate by the Board, at least until that obstacle had been cleared. Without such an assumption, its function could hardly be regarded as meaningful by the Faculty Committee or the Faculty which had established it. The last President of the University, the late Dr. Carroll, had been selected with the full approval of another Faculty Committee, even prior to the adoption of the Faculty Code. This fact could be considered a significant precedent. Moreover, one candidate in the present search who had been regarded as most acceptable by the Board Chairman had been dropped after the Faculty Committee had set forth to the Chairman its strong reasons for objecting to this particular individual.

4) Our review of the relationships between the two committees made it clear that during the May/June period, the communications from the Chairman of the Board to the Faculty Committee were lacking in candor. In view of the fundamental

requirement of good faith throughout this whole process, this lack introduced a disturbing element of uncertainty and distrust into the last stage of the selection process. We have also learned that Dr. Elliott was offered the presidency of The George Washington University without disclosure of the adverse recommendation of the Faculty Advisory Committee. We believe that his acceptance of this position under such circumstances put him in a very embarrassing position both in Maine and in Washington, D. C. for which he was not responsible. We recommend that the Faculty welcome Dr. Lloyd Elliott as the new President of The George Washington University.

5) The inability of the Faculty Committee to obtain from the Board Committee or its Chairman for the first four months meaningful information as to the candidates under active consideration, was the result of inaction by the Board Committee. It also affected adversely the Faculty Committee's role and made it appear to be somewhat of an outsider in the selection process. While the information on a number of names was available in the winter for several months, the process of selection appeared to have come to a dead end early in the month of May.

6) The lack of indications to the Faculty from its Committee, to show continuing positive action in the process of selection, stimulated individual communications to the Board of Trustees, out of channels, by Faculty members. It would appear that the first memorandum from the Deans and Chairmen to the Board of Trustees dated May 8, 1965 was communicated directly to the Board rather than through the Faculty Committee for much the same reasons. While these actions were undertaken by members of the University moved by a deep concern for the welfare of the University, they had some unintended side effects; a) from the point of view of some of those persons primarily concerned in the selection process, they appeared to diminish the authority of the Faculty Committee, and b) in the eyes of some members of the Board of Trustees, they appeared to be manifestations of improper group pressures from the Faculty.

7) A word is in order about the role of the Washington press in this process. At critical stages both before the Board of Trustees made its choice, and on several occasions afterward, the local newspapers displayed a disquieting lack of responsibility which was shown in possibly unavoidable inadequacy in factual reporting and in distorted editorial comment. The issues involved have been misrepresented with the result that interested members of the Washington community have received a highly distorted view of the University's situation.

Inasmuch as the connection between key members of the University Board of Trustees and the two leading Washington newspapers is widely known, this relationship has unfortunately lent in the eyes of some persons a certain plausibility to the view that these papers allowed themselves to be used as an instrument in the relations between the Trustees and the Faculty of The George Washington University. We deplore this view as over-simplified, but we also deplore the press activities which made possible these allegations.

* * * * *

Your Committee will continue its investigations of the matters within our commission on Faculty/Trustee relations, and will make reports on these issues, together with its recommendations, at subsequent meetings of the Faculty Assembly.

Reuben E. Wood, Chairman

Wolfgang H. Kraus

James Forrester Davison